

*DANIEL J. SAHAS*

**CAPTIVITY AND DIALOGUE:  
GREGORY PALAMAS (1296-1360) AND THE MUSLIMS**

In the beginning of 1354 Gregory Palamas (1296-1360), Archbishop of Thessalonike and the principal spokesman for the hesychasts,<sup>1</sup> the mystical movement flourishing then especially in the monastic republic of Mount Athos, was sailing from Thessalonike to the Byzantine capital of Constantinople. The purpose of this trip was to bring about a reconciliation between the young self-exiled heir to the throne John V Palaiologos (1341-1391) and the Grand Domestic John Kantakouzenos, who, upon the death of Andronikos III Palaiologos in 1341 had proclaimed himself emperor – an event that sparked even another civil war in the fourteenth century Byzantium. The trip was undertaken at the request of John Palaiologos<sup>2</sup> and his mother, Empress Ann of Savoy, who although fully aware of Palamas' sympathy towards Kantakouzenos, was nevertheless respectful of his integrity, theological soundness, and statesmanship.

The first stop of the journey on a royal boat, was at the island of Tenedos in the Aegean at the mouth of the straits of the Dardalles, a stop-over for Palamas to receive further instructions on his assignment. Up to this point the trip progressed with no interruptions. Leaving Tenedos, however, on another boat the travellers met with a fierce storm which forced the captain to seek refuge at a place near the city of Kallipolis (Gallipoli) on the European side of the straits. Kallipolis had just suffered from a severe earthquake which had left it almost in ruins and without defense. In such a condition the city was captured by the Osmanli Turks, from the Asiatic side of the straits.<sup>3</sup> The boat, unable to leave Kallipolis, was taken over by the Turks who demanded ransom money for the release of its passengers. With communication with the imperial court impaired, the ransom price continuously raised as the prominence of Palamas was becoming known, and with the ransom money coming from nowhere, a long captivity began, which was to take Palamas and his companions through a number of cities of northwestern Asia Minor, or Anatolia. Palamas' captivity lasted for over a year, from March 1354 to July 1355.

The events which led to his captivity, his journey through the newly conquered Christian cities, his contacts with the Christian



population, his impression of his Turkish captors and his debates with Muslims on matters of religion, Palamas himself describes in a rather lengthy letter, of pastoral character, to the Christians of his archdiocese. The credit of drawing attention and making the first analysis of its historical content belongs to G. Georgiades Arnakis.<sup>4</sup> The letter, although in manuscript and printed form, had by-passed the attention even of such a careful student of Palamas as Gregory Papamichael. The earliest evidence of such a letter is Philotheos himself, although the text seems to have been deleted from Migne's edition of the *Encomion*.<sup>5</sup>

The text of Palamas' letter to the Thessalonians is found in three manuscripts:

1. The Athonite MS of St. Panteleimon Monastery, No. 215. This was copied by A. Adamantios on 3 August 1895 at the instruction of Spyros Lambros, who verified the accuracy of the manuscript. This transcript was prefaced and published by K. Dyovouniotes in the Greek journal *Neos Hellenomnemon* (Athens) 16 (1922) 7-21. It is this text which we are offering here in translation.
2. Codex No. 1379 of the National Library of Athens. The letter is between the leaves 408b-415b, according to the information of A. I. Sakkelion.<sup>6</sup>
3. Codex No. 2409 of the National Library of Paris, which is mentioned by M. Treu.<sup>7</sup>

A fourth manuscript edition seems to be that of the Parisian Codex Coislin Nos. 97 and 98.<sup>8</sup> To our knowledge there has been no critical edition of the text and this is the first translation of the letter in its entirety. There has been also no serious challenge to the authenticity of the letter. An exception has been M. Jugie who left the question open,<sup>9</sup> but prior to Arnakis' studies and the subsequent debates, all treating the text as authentic.

The exact date of the letter is not established. The titles in the two first MSS suggest that Palamas *sent* the letter to his church from Asia while he was captive there. However the title of the letter in the Parisian MS indicates that Palamas *wrote* the letter while captive in Asia. It seems most likely that Palamas wrote the letter during the last part of his captivity in Nicaea in July 1355, as he himself states,<sup>10</sup> or even in Constantinople after his release during the same year. This is attested also by the fact that the letter refers to Palamas' debate with the Chiones, which took place just prior to his transfer to Nicaea. This debate has been recorded and chronicled



by the physician Taronites as having taken place "in the month of July, on the eighth indiction of the year 1363"<sup>11</sup> (i.e. 1355). Secondly the wording of the letter seems to suggest that the captivity had ended when the letter was being written.<sup>12</sup> Thirdly it seems logical to assume that such a long letter, containing very negative and at times very derogatory expressions against the Turks and their religion, would not have been allowed to leave Anatolia, or would not have reached Thessalonike safely. Thus it seems that, although Palamas wrote the letter during the last days of a relatively easy captivity in Nicaea—a phase which he describes in more detail—he sent it to Thessalonike after he was released from the captivity and he had arrived in Constantinople, an event which took place in the summer of the same year 1355.

Prior to his transfer to Nicaea, Palamas was engaged in an inter-faith dialogue with Emir Orkhan's own "wise and reputable men" on matters of religion, who are identified as "Chiones." Who are these Chiones is not clear from Palamas' letter. G. G. Arnakis and Paul Wittek have debated the question in a series of articles.<sup>13</sup> From the context of the debate, recorded by Taronites who was an eye and ear witness, we gather that the Chiones were former Jews converted to Islam, perhaps Greek-speaking, eager to please Orkhan and very anxious to conceal their possible ignorance or incompetence on matters of the Islamic faith! The text of this debate, or *Dialexis*, has been published by A.I. Sakkelion from a seventeenth century MS of the National Library of Athens (no.1379, fol.415b-18a, following the text of Palamas' letter to the Thessalonians).<sup>14</sup>

The text of the letter and that of the *Dialexis* form together a unit which is our main source of Palamas' experience of the Turkish captivity. Chronologically both texts belong to the same year (1355) and possibly to the same month, the letter being written after the *Dialexis*. Although the latter did not come out of the hand of the archbishop, it contains definitely his thoughts and his actions. For the sequence of the events, the progression of Palamas' experience of the Turks and his acquaintance with Islam, we have inserted the *Dialexis* at the point of its historical occurrence as it is indicated in the letter. Here are the texts:

By the same<sup>1</sup>

#### Letter Which He Sent to His Church From Asia While Captive

The humble Metropolitan of Thessalonike, to all those who are to me, the humble one, beloved children and brethren in the Holy



Spirit; as well as to their Graces the Bishops and the ecclesiastical officials and through them to everyone, and particularly to those of you who want to know about us, may mercy eternal from God, grace and peace be abundant upon you.

God's judgement—I mean His providence for us—is abysmal, as we have been taught also by David, the revealer of God, that the height or depth of His wisdom is inscrutable.<sup>2</sup> However, there are those who out of, let us say, weak mind as if becoming dizzy in such things, and spinning around and falling down badly, either reject the notion of providence disrespectfully or they reprove uncritically the life of those who suffer or they wickedly mistake virtue and even faith itself as empty and silly. He, however, who is of sound mind, the more he observes that abyss and height and reaches the point of contemplation, the more he talks about it and marvels at, along with the invisible, the visible. I will narrate therefore to your love what I have perceived to be of the providence of God, when I was led to Asia through captivity, seeing the Christians and the Turks mixing with each other, going about their lives, leading and being led by each other. For it seems to me that it is through this dispensation that the truth about our Lord Jesus Christ, the God over all, became manifest even to those most barbaric among the barbarians, so that they may be without excuse in front of His most fearful tribunal in the age to come, which is already at hand. It is because of such a dispensation, as one can gather from the events, that we also were delivered unto their hands, as a small expiation for our many sins committed against God—a kind of fire, extinguishable though, to which those who are now tried are delivered; while those who inflict insults, if they happen not to repent for their unbelief and their brutality, are to be kept in a fire which is never to be extinguished. And even if I had lost almost completely interest in the diligence of writing—something which I have overlooked for such a long time—I could never have found a more worthwhile subject, befitting to me the most and not least demanding description, than what happened to me lately. In this respect it should be my task to go through our acts, and the acts of those in power towards us.

Thus, up to Tenedos I travelled on the imperial trireme.<sup>3</sup> From there on, while journeying through Bithynia and Mesothynia, I missed nothing of what was happening in Constantinople, either on the land or in the sea, including those things from above (I do not know whether I should call them chastisements or abandon-



ments) which our nation suffered, and especially the earthquake which left not only buildings and properties, but also bodies and lives, in the words of the poet,<sup>4</sup> "prey to dogs" and to all kinds of vultures, human and non-human. But let me not bypass everything and cause disappointment, but describe for those of you who wish to know, a few of my experiences.

A few days after that earthquake we embarked on an eight-hundred-medimni<sup>5</sup> ship from Tenedos; would that had never happened. As we encountered a strong wind and as the captain was deeply in debt, or rather stupefied and from then on against saving the ship, we sailed at once up to a point off Kallipolis.<sup>6</sup> Then the wind turned and it was not hitting the prow. However, we did not give way, but set ourselves against it, rather than being carried away by the attacking force, and all this during night and wintry time. As we were in imminent danger as soon as we managed finally to come to one accord with each other, and with the courage and the undertakings of the good captain, we hit the stern. Giving in to the force of the wind—a forceful north wind—we let ourselves be carried back to Kallipolis. However, since that earthquake had placed that city, too, under the Achaimenidae,<sup>7</sup> whom we now call Turks, and it was impossible for us to moor at its port, we brought the ship to a halt somewhere at a nearby shore, by casting all its anchors. At daybreak, the north wind not being any milder, we saw the Turks on the ground and in the sea going back and forth in contingents and a number of them rowing speedily as if they were binding together the two opposite continents and rushing from the eastern continent to pillage the Romans living on the opposite side. Being therefore aware of all these things, we all begged the captain to bring us back to Tenedos so that we might not, by delaying, fall badly into the hands of the Turks. As he was not convinced, we all offered him gifts and promised him big remunerations; we, the unfortunate ones, who under these circumstances were in need of a captain, and who allowed ourselves, mistakenly, to such a plunder. We even showed him how imminent and inevitable the danger was should, indeed, the strong wind force us to stay there anchored, tossing us to and fro! He, however remained unconvinced, puffing at the expected enemy. Finally the wind subsided, but the barbarians attacked the boat, fully armed and with big rather than small boats. Having given a fight (on what do I need to expatiate?), we were badly defeated and taken captives; and we were not a small number.



First, we all were led together to Lampsakos.<sup>8</sup> Immediately, and from then on, I shared every consequence of the captivity with my fellow captives, such as exposure, lack of necessities, intestinal disorders, emaciation of the body as a result of them, and almost paralysis of the members. There was, on the other hand, quite a protest raised among the local Romans<sup>9</sup> to the barbarians, supposedly in my favor, praising highly my education and virtues and bringing forth my struggles, as they said, for the Church. Such things were exaggerated, although not falsely, as only I am in a position to know better, and in no way were they profitable to me. Because the hope thence got into the mind of the ruler of the barbarians to gain money from me in thousands. Thus he instigated those who adhere to the barbaric faith<sup>10</sup> to become enraged against me and even some of them to molest me and pick an argument and, if they prove weak in all other respects, to use our captivity as a proof of the ineffectiveness of our faith.

Thus they—this impious and god-hated and all-abominable race—boast that they dominate the Romans on account of their own faith in God. They ignore that this world rests in evil and that evil men and servants of this low world are those who dominate the greatest part of it, who dislodge their neighbors by force and with weapons. That is why the idolaters dominated almost the entire universe for the entire time up to Constantine, the truly God-loving king. And again since then—a long time in between—they [the Turks] are little, if any, different from those previous ones [i.e. the idolaters]. It seems to me therefore that these, too, who boast of their evil deeds will suffer the same as the pagans. They, says the apostle, “will be given up to a base mind . . . for although they knew God they did not honor him or respect him as God.”<sup>11</sup> They, too, although they knew Christ—for they confess that he is word and spirit of God, and also that he was born from a virgin, and that he did and taught like God, that he ascended into heaven, that he remains immortal, and that he is going to come to judge the entire world—although, therefore, they knew Christ this way, they did not honor him as Christ, that is as God-man Word. Instead, they exchanged the truth for falsehood and they believed, honored and followed a mere man, mortal and buried, Muhammad that is, rather than the God-man, the ever-living and eternal Word. Who, although he tasted death in flesh, yet he did so in order to abolish death, and become ruler of the eternal and inviolate life, a life which the passion, death and resurrection of a mere man could never provide. Thus all those



who rose from the dead lived the mortal and our kind of life, and died again. "Death," however, once Christ rose from the dead, "no longer has dominion over him";<sup>12</sup> on the contrary, the future and everlasting life is made known beforehand [through him].

Since, therefore, knowing who Christ was they did not glorify nor did they worship him as Christ, "God gave them up to a base mind,"<sup>13</sup> to passions and dishonorable deeds. As a result they live a reproachful, inhuman, and God-hated life—like that of the son Esau, hated by God and cast out of his father's blessing—to live a prodigal life in swords and knives, indulging in slavery, murder, plundering, rape, licentiousness, adultery, and homosexuality. Not only are they doing such things, but—what a madness!—they even believe that God gives them His consent. This is my impression of them, now that I know their ways better.

You should remember also that we were frequently surrounded by a crowd of men and women; some of them wanting to tell us about their own lives and be cured of their spiritual afflictions; others to find answers to questions on matters of faith, most of them wondering why God had abandoned our nation so much; and some others to cry out their sympathy for my misfortune. Thus, having stayed there for seven days—being on the seventh day afflicted by the barbarians in order to raise our ransom—on the eighth day we took up the road leading to Pegai. Even if I wanted to tell you the sufferings of this journey in detail, neither the ink nor the paper that I have now available would be enough. At any rate, in three days they led us to Pegai. First of all they let us, utterly exhausted from the walk and from what they did to us during the journey, spend two days in the open, even though it was icy cold. Then they took me and the monks separately, and threatened us with threats that are unbearable even to hear, forcing us to raise the amount of our ransom. As they did not succeed—for my entire property, as one can find many who know this, consists only of what I need every day—as, therefore, they did not succeed in securing what they demanded, they did not carry out their threats. Instead, they led us to a church of Christ, which still survives by His power praising Him out loud, which we felt as a peaceful harbor after those many storms of all sorts. For there were monks and lay people living about the church—pleasant harbors on the opposite side for those who were ending up there from captivity—from whom we, too, received not a small comfort.<sup>14</sup> I, therefore, with all the others who were with me, was offered hospitality by Mavro-



zoumis, who was different from all the rest in kindness. He was an heteriarch.<sup>15</sup> He gave us shelter, and since we were naked he clothed us, and hungry he gave us food, being thirsty he gave us drink. He actually nourished us for almost three months. Moreover, he delivered us from the company of the barbarians, he comforted us and made it possible for us to teach in Church according to our practice, and to provide spiritual relief to the indigenous Christians and to those who as captives were gathered there.

After three months had passed, as I just mentioned, we were taken up from there by lawless hands and led to Prusa<sup>16</sup> in four days. Here those Christians who differed in prudence, while associating with us were touching upon more serious matters; and that under unfavorable circumstances, for the barbarians were all around us. And, those who exerted themselves in piety disregarded such unfavorable time, for they thought that they unexpectedly had in front of them the man who could tell them about the things they wanted to know. After two days had passed, accompanied by those who had led us to Prusa, we arrived, again in two days, at a hilly village surrounded at a distance by mountains and beautified by thick shade trees. Winds blowing continuously, now from the one now from the other side of the mountain ridges, give it a very cool draught, and the air all around is cold even during the summer which made the supreme ruler of the barbarians spend the summer in that place.

When the other captives and I arrived there was sent to us a grandson of the great Emir. He invited me apart from the rest of the captives, and he sat down with me on the soft grass with a few leaders surrounding him. After we sat down they brought to me fruits and to him meat. At his signal we began eating, myself the fruits and he the meat. As we were eating he asked me if I ever eat any meat and for what reason.<sup>17</sup> As soon as I gave the proper answer to the question, somebody came in from outside apologizing for his tardiness. "Only now" he said "was I able to finish the distribution of alms which the great Emir has ordered to take place every Friday." Thence we began a long discussion on almsgiving. "Do you also practice almsgiving?" asked Ishmael; that was the name of the grandson of the great Emir. I said to him that the true almsgiving is the one which derives from the love towards the true God, and that the more one loves God, the more and truly benevolent he is. Then he asked me again whether we also accept and love their prophet Muhammad. When I answered in the negative, he asked for the reason. I offered a sufficient defense on this matter



also, as it was appropriate to the interlocutor who did not believe in the teaching of the Teacher,<sup>18</sup> and who said that one should not love the Teacher as teacher. "But," he said, "on the one hand you love Isa<sup>19</sup> (this is how he called the Christ), and on the other hand you believe that he was crucified!" I agreed with this assertion and bringing forth the matter of the voluntary character, the way and the glory of the passion, and the matter of the impassibility of the divine nature, I explained with a few words what he thought to be a contradiction. As I did this he asked me again, "Why do you venerate the wood and the cross?" I gave him to this also the response which God had provided, adding "Would you not accept those who would honor your insignia, and punish severely those who would dishonor them; Christ's banner of victory and His sign are the cross." He, however, wanted to ridicule further and defame our beliefs as inappropriate, and said, "At any rate, you believe that God has had a wife, for you proclaim that He gave birth to a son." Then I said to him again, "The Turks say that Christ is the word of God,<sup>20</sup> and that he was born from the virgin Mary,<sup>21</sup> whom we glorify as Theotokos. Therefore, if Mary, who gave birth to Christ insofar as the flesh is concerned, did not have a husband, nor did she need one—since she gave birth, physically, to the Word of God—much more it is so with God, Who, in giving birth to His own word, incorporeally (being Himself incorporeal) and in a God-like manner, has had no wife, nor did He need any, as you wrongly presume." Well, he did not dispose himself angrily against this either, although, those who know him say that originally he was unrelenting and enraging against the Christians. To those last words a heavy rainstorm began, and he got up and left running, while I returned to where the captives were, suffering the rain with them in the open air. When the rain had stopped and the day was coming to a close, late in the evening our captors brought us all before the presence of the ruler.

At his command we were then led to the neighboring town which had been inhabited by Roman Christians for a long time, in which there was also a residence for the royal ambassadors. Thus, we were meeting with them<sup>22</sup> day after day, receiving from them provisions and some consolation; and neither did the roughness and the severe cold weather of the place, nor the constant need of necessary goods for those in my company who were sick, succeed to succumb the good will of those men. When once the Emir suffered from a liver trouble, there arrived called for that purpose, the good man Taro-



nites, a most God-loving and pious doctor who did everything for me and who, when he saw that it would be profitable for me spiritually and physically to be transferred to Nicaea, made every effort to convince the Emir [to let me go]. He asked him about me saying, "Who and what kind of man is this monk?" And when he answered whatever he answered, the Emir said, I, too, have wise and reputable men to engage in a dialogue with him." He, then, sent immediately to call the Chiones; men who, taught by the Satan, had studied nothing else but blasphemies and shameful things towards our Lord Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God. When they were there, Taronites, who was an eye and ear-witness, kept written notes of everything that was spoken and done which he has circulated; and anyone who wants may go through and know about.

By the Same GREGORY OF THESSALONIKE

To the Atheist Chiones

An Exchange Written by, and Taken Place in the Presence of,  
Taronites the Doctor, an Ear-witness

There came the Chiones, "by the command of the Emir," they said, "to converse with the metropolitan of Thessalonike." They were afraid, however, to start a controversy in front of him and first of all they tried to convince me, the bishop and especially the associates of the Emir, that no confrontation may take place on such matters. Being unable to achieve this, they tried again to convince us that at least such a debate may not take place in front of the Emir; which they succeeded. And he [the Emir] appointed a number of officials and a certain so-called Palapanes.<sup>23</sup> These men came along with the Chiones to the place where the metropolitan was. Thus we sat all together and the Chiones began a long talk. The main point of their talk was that "We were taught ten commandments which Moses brought down, written on slates of stone. We also knew that the Turks hold the same ones. We left, therefore, the faith which we had before, came to them and became Turks too."

The officials then asked the Metropolitan to respond, and he began with these words: "I should not respond now, because who am I, compared to the height and greatness of the catholic and apostolic Church of my Christ, to try to defend her? I am only a minimal part of her and almost nothing at all. Secondly, these officials, who



are also sitting as judges, support the side of the opponents and it is not appropriate for me to show in what they will respond the justifications of faith, which are the God-inspired Scripture and especially the books of the Prophets. Thirdly, I am kept in captivity, and I know after the example of the Lord, God and Savior of ours, Jesus Christ, that after being convicted, even when asked questions, he did not give answers. However, since this is what the great Emir orders—and I perceive that God gave him the right to know what a ruler has to know; because while the duty of the servant or of any common individual is to know about one faith and this only barely, it is necessary for him who has many races under his rule to know of all faiths and in an accurate way—for this reason I want to talk about our faith, all that the word of God will provide for me as I will open my mouth, And in doing so I will not be responding to the Chiones. For they, from what I heard about them before and from what they are now saying, seem to be Jews, not Muslims;<sup>24</sup> and my talk now is not to the Jews.

Thus, this mystery of our faith goes like this: Only God is the eternal Being and the One who remains for ever, without beginning, unchangeable, without end, immutable, uncompound, unconfused, unlimited. Every creature, however, is subject to corruption and change. Even the beginning itself is a change which came into being from non-existence. This God, therefore, the only one without a beginning, is not without wisdom. Thus the word of God is also the wisdom of God; for wisdom is in the word and without word wisdom does not exist.

Therefore if there were ever a time when the word or the wisdom of God did not exist, God would then be without word and without wisdom, which is a blasphemy and something impossible. Thus the word of God also is without beginning and the wisdom of God is never separated from Him. Also there is no word ever without spirit, something you, too, Turks confess. For by saying that Christ is the Word of God, you confess him also to be the Spirit of God, for this [the word] is never separated from the divine spirit. Thus God has both, word and spirit, which are with Him and in Him without beginning and without separation. God was never, nor will He ever be, without Spirit or word. Therefore, all three are one, and one the three.

God has word and spirit not in the manner we have them, vanishing in the air, but in a divine manner. To use an example: as the splendor of the sun is born from it, and the ray of the sun proceeds



from it and comes down to us and never, neither the splendor, nor the ray, are they separated from the disc—for which reason when we call them “sun” we do not say that each one of them is different from the one—in the same way when we say that the Word of God, and the Holy Spirit too, is God, we do not confess another God but only the One who is perceived to be without beginning and without end, with a co-eternal word and spirit. This is what the Word of God taught us to believe and confess; not only Christ but Moses also in the Decalogue, whom you, the Chiones, bring forth. That is why he said “God is one” and he said the “one” three times. For he said the word “Lord” twice and the word “God” once to show that the three are one and the one three. Also Moses, wanting to show from the beginning that God has word and spirit and that in them and with them He is one God creator of all created things said “God said: ‘Let it be light’; and there was light.”<sup>26</sup> . . . He said, ‘Let the earth put forth vegetation’ . . . And it was so.”<sup>27</sup> And so that I may not repeat everything, as David said, “God said and everything was made.”<sup>28</sup> Therefore this “God said and everything was made” shows that God has word, for there is no speech without word. It also shows that all the created things were made by the means of it. Thus this word of God existed prior to all created things and he was uncreated. The word of God, being uncreated, how is he not God since only God is uncreated? Moses, teaching also about man says: “God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being.”<sup>29</sup> Therefore, by saying that God breathed and that is how the living man was made, he shows that God has also spirit and that this spirit is creative. But only God is creator of living beings. That is why Job says: “It is the spirit of God that made me.”<sup>30</sup>

The bishop of Thessalonike<sup>31</sup> wanted also to string together the rest of the evidence from the prophets and especially those through which it is shown that God works the renewal of man and of the entire world by means of His spirit; such as what David says “He sent forth his word, and healed them, and delivered them from destruction”<sup>32</sup> and elsewhere again “Thou shalt send forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created; and thou shalt renew the face of the earth.”<sup>33</sup> These are the quotations which the bishop had started already stating, when all those attending interrupted him saying “What you are saying is true and cannot be otherwise.” Then the bishop responded to them “God, therefore, these three, is one God, creator.” And they, either moved by the divine power to do so or because they were unable to object, agreed again say-



ing: "This is what you have shown and this is the truth. This is what we also maintain." The bishop said: "Good. Glory be to our God who has willed so." But they, too, said again: "But tell us this, how do you confess Christ to be God since he was a human and was born as human?" Again the bishop, "God is not only sovereign and all-mighty, but righteous as well, as David the prophet says: 'The Lord our God is righteous, and loves righteousness; there is no injustice in him.'<sup>34</sup> There is no work of God, therefore, that does not have in it the righteousness of God. As the ray of the sun has also the life-giving power, as well as light and warmth, so does the divine energy have in itself the divine power and the righteousness. God created man to do good deeds and commanded him to live according to His own divine will. When, therefore, this man obeyed and submitted himself to the devil willingly, and he sinned by transgressing the divine will and he was, justly, sentenced to death, it was not congenial to God to redeem man from him [the devil] by force; that way He would have been unjust to the devil, to have pulled out from his hands by force man whom he did not get by force. Also the free will of man would have been destroyed by the force and the power, as God would have been freeing man; and it is not like God to destroy His own work. It was, therefore, necessary that a sinless man be made, who would be without sin and who would live without sin and who, this way, would help the man who had sinned willingly. For it says: "Not even one is without sin; if even his life should be but one day."<sup>35</sup> David also the prophet says: "I was conceived in iniquities, and in sins did my mother conceive me."<sup>36</sup>

For this reason the only sinless Word of God becomes a son of man, is born from a virgin, is witnessed to with the voice of the Father from heaven, is tempted and fought by the devil, defeats the tempter, shows and confirms through deeds, words and great miracles the faith and the conduct of salvation and, in this way, He who was innocent and sinless, by living (as a human) he takes up to himself the passions of us who were the responsible ones, even to the extent of death, so that He may descend also to Hades and save those in there who may believe.

At this point—as the bishop talked about the resurrection and the ascension of the Lord and of the testimonies of the prophets which show that Christ is also God and that this God is the one who is witnessed to as having become man from the virgin and suffered for us and risen, and everything else—the Turks became disturbed, and they interrupted him saying, "How can you say that



God was born and that the womb of a woman contained him, and many such things? God only said and Christ, too, was made.”<sup>37</sup> He then said to them, “God is not a big body that cannot fit because of its size into something small. On the contrary, by being incorporeal He is able to be everywhere, beyond everything and in one single thing. He can fit even into the smallest possible thing that one can imagine.” They, however, protested again noisily, saying that “God only said and Christ, too, was made.” The bishop said again: “You confess that Christ is the word of God. A word, then, is made again by another word? In such a case it will mean that the word of God is not co-eternal with God Himself. But I showed you this at the beginning and you, too, confessed that God has a Word and a Spirit co-eternal with Him. That is why you call Christ not only word but also spirit of God. God said and things were made, like this stone—pointing to a stone nearby—the herb and even the reptiles. Therefore, if Christ is the word and spirit of God because he was made by the word of God, then the stone, the herb and everyone of the reptiles is also word and spirit of God because in their case also He said and they were made! You see how absurd it is to say that “God said and Christ, too, was made”? The pre-eternal Word of God, even though he became human and took up flesh, without mixture [of the two] nor in the manner of flesh, is spirit and word of God. It was later, as we said, that he took up from us and for our sake the human nature. He was always in God as His co-eternal Word “through whom God created the world.”<sup>38</sup>

At this point the Chiones interrupted him again, and the presiding Palapanos, after he called for silence, said to the bishop, “The master demands from you to answer the question how we accept Christ, love him, respect him, confess him to be God’s word and breath, and we also place his mother near to God, and yet you do not accept our prophet nor do you love him?” Then the bishop said: “He who does not believe in the words of a teacher cannot love the teacher himself; that is why we do not love Muhammad. Our Lord God Jesus Christ has said to us that he will come again to judge the entire world. He also commanded us not to receive anyone else until He will come back to us again. He also said to those who disbelieved in him: “I have come in my Father’s name, and you do not receive me, nor did you accept me; if another comes in his own name, him you will receive.”<sup>39</sup> That is why the disciple [sic] of Christ writes to us: “But even if an angel preaches



to you contrary to that which you have received from us let him be accursed.”<sup>40</sup>

Then the Chiones, along with the Turks, said to the bishop: “Circumcision was handed down by God from the very beginning. Even Christ himself was circumcized. How then, you do not circumcize yourselves?” Then the bishop: “Since you are referring to the old law and to what was handed down by God to the Hebrews at that time—for traditions of God also were the keeping of the Sabbath, the Jewish passover, sacrifices which were to be offered exclusively by the priests, the altar in the interior of the temple, and the dividing curtain—since all these and other such things have also been handed down by God, why do you not cherish any of them and you do not practice them?”

As the Chiones and Turks had no response to this, the bishop wanted to bring forth again those prophets who foretell clearly the transfer of the law and of that old testament and [who also foretell] that the transfer will take place through Christ; and he started saying: “That which you also call old...”<sup>41</sup> They interrupted him again saying: “Why do you place many representations in your churches and you venerate them, even though God wrote and said to Moses: ‘Thou shalt not make a likeness of anything, whatever things are in heaven above, and whatever are in the earth beneath, and whatever are in the sea?’”<sup>42</sup> And the bishop said again: “Friends are venerated by each other, but they are not made gods. It is evident to everyone that this is, indeed, what Moses learned from God and this is what he taught the people then. However, this same Moses again and at that time, left almost nothing of which he did not make a representation. He made the area beyond the curtain to be like and represent the celestial [reality]. Also, since the Cherubim are in heaven, he made representations of them and placed them into the innermost sanctuary of the temple. As to the exterior of the temple, he made it to represent the earthly [reality]. If anyone, then, had questioned Moses “Why have you made anyway such things, since God forbids the icons and the likeness of things in heaven and of things on earth?”, he would have, certainly, answered that “icons and representations are forbidden so that one may not worship them as gods. However, if one is to be elevated through them toward God, this is good!” The Greeks, too, praised created things but they did so as if they were gods. We praise them too, but we elevate ourselves through them to the glory of God.” Then the Turks said again: “Did, indeed, Moses



make these things then?" Answered many, "Yes, he did all these things."

At this point the officials of the Turks stood up, greeted with respect the bishop, and started leaving. One of the Chiones, however, stayed behind, insulted the great bishop of God, attacked him and beat him in the eye. The rest of the Turks who saw him, got hold of him, rebuked him severely and brought him in front of the Emir to whom they said whatever they said. What the Turks said to the Emir we did not hear exactly. As to what we have written down, however, we have been ear-witnesses. We wrote down what we saw and heard under the sight of God Himself.

This exchange<sup>43</sup> took place in the month of July, on the eighth indiction of the year 1363.<sup>44</sup>

You should know also that I came to live in Nicaea during which time, having some freedom, I described briefly to your love the things regarding my captivity, leaving aside those things regarding our brethren in Christ, my fellow-captives for His sake. So that you may know a few things of what happened approximately there, it is only when they transfer us from city to city or town that the barbarians place guards for us; and it would be something very pleasant, indeed, to the ears of the Christians, if one had the time to write down their questions to us and our responses to them, or the things on which they concur with us, or simply all the conversations we had on the way. But when the guards bring us into the designated city or town, each one of them retires to his own, allowing us to stay or go wherever we please, and to associate with anyone we want, and I think that this, too, is not something that is not of a major providence.

As soon as they left us also free in Nicaea therefore, as usual, we asked as to where most of the Christians of this city live. When we learned that they lived by the monastery of Saint Hyacinth we went there immediately and met with the Christians who were eagerly expecting us and wishing such a things to happen. In the interior, beyond the yard of the monastery, we found a beautiful church and a well with fresh water in the midst of various thick-shade trees sumptuously blooming. The cool breeze, the comfort of the shade and the soothing quietness of the place, made us settle there; actually I did so, for I was alone. As far as the most God-loving chartophylax<sup>45</sup> is concerned, whom they had brought in front of the great Emir, I did not know where exactly he was al-



lowed to stay. As to the hieromonks Joseph and my own Gerasimos, they were already in Constantinople at that time. Konstas Kalamaris was still then alone in Prusa, living in the home of a certain pious man who had set him free with money. As he had not paid back the whole amount for his freedom, when I arrived there I paid the entire amount for him with the help, or rather by a miracle, of God, and he was set free. But I did not take him then with me, for I did not know where I was going to end up. But now, having written him and asked him to come, I the captive have him, the free man, as a companion and servant! And let this be added to the strange stories; that the captive grants freedom to his fellow-captive and he, who is not even master of himself, has under his authority a free man!

In the ensuing I will tell you a story from when, as I said, I was living alone: I went once out the gate of the city that was, and was called, "eastern," the closest also of all others. As I had walked a little beyond the gate—what can I say about the height and the beauty of the buildings, or about the fortifications; all these were in abundance in that city although to no avail now!—well as I had walked a little further, I saw in the plains a cubic structure made of marble and somewhat artistically decorated. I then asked those who happened to be around what is the use of that cube being outside [the walls] of the city, and standing there nearby, ready. They told me what the cube was for, and that is how the whole conversation ended. Then we heard wailing coming from inside the city. As we turned to the direction of the noise we saw a whole group of barbarians bringing out the body of a dead man. Walking slowly we came so close to them that we were able to see and hear what they were doing and saying. When they arrived at the cube they all observed an absolute silence and then more of them, lifting up the box wrapped in white sheets with the dead man inside, placed it solemnly on the cube. Surrounding him they had in their midst one of their Tasimanes—this is how they call those dedicated to their sacred places. He, raising up his hands, let out a cry and they responded even louder. He did this three times. Then those who were set to do the burying take the box up on their arms and walk further down. All the rest, with the Tasimanes, return home.

We also were returning, entering next to them the same gate when we noted that the Tasimanes with a few others sat down under the shadow of the gate to enjoy the cool air of the season; for it was July. Suspecting that those sitting on the opposite side might be Christians, which they were, we sat down, too. As I was sitting



there I asked whether anyone could speak both languages that I needed. There was somebody, whom I asked to say to the Turks on my behalf that what they had performed outside there I thought was good, "for you addressed yourselves to God—to whom else?—for the deceased one. I wanted, however, to know what was that you exclaimed to God?" Tasimanes using the same interpreter, said that he would explain: "We asked for forgiveness from God for the deceased, for his own sins committed in his soul." Retorting myself I said, "Very well, but the judge is merciful, indeed, and dispenses mercy; and he who will come as judge of every race of men, even according to you, is Christ. You must be addressing, therefore, the prayers and the exclamations to Him. Thus you, too, invoke him as God, as we do, who believe that as an inborn Word of His he is indivisible from the Father; for there was no time when God was without reason or without the natural word." Tasimanes then said, "Christ, too, is a servant of God."<sup>46</sup> I said to him "But you must consider this, my good man, that as you also say, He will judge the living and the dead, who will rise and present themselves in front of Him at a fearful and impartial tribunal in the coming presence of His. Abraham, who is also your own forefather as you have it in your own scriptures (for you insist that you uphold the tradition of Moses, as it is also maintained by the Jews), this Abraham, therefore, says to God, 'Thou that judgest the whole earth, shalt thou not do right?'<sup>47</sup> Thus He who will judge the entire earth is himself God, who, according to Daniel the prophet is King of the whole universe forever,<sup>48</sup> being no different than the Father according to the divinity; in the same way as the brightness of the sun is no different than the sun, so far as the light is concerned."

Tasimanes gave the impression that he found himself in a difficult situation, but after a brief silence he started a longer speech. Then many more Christians and Turks gathered to listen. Thus, he began saying that they accept all the prophets including Christ as well as the four books sent down from God, one of which is also the gospel of Christ.<sup>49</sup> When he finished he turned the speech to me saying, "Why then, do you not accept our prophet or do you not believe that his book came down from heaven?" I said to him again: "Your custom and our custom, that has been confirmed by antiquity and law, is to accept or consent to nothing as true without witnesses. And there are two kinds of witnesses; either those of their works and deeds, or those of trustworthy persons. Thus Moses disciplined Egypt with signs and marvels. With his rod he split the sea into two and he united it again. He also brought down



bread from heaven. But what is the use of mentioning the rest since you also believe in Moses? He has also been witnessed to by God as a trustworthy servant, although not as a Son and Word. Later on, at God's commandment, he ascended the mountain and died, and he added himself to those who had preceded him. On the other hand, Christ, in addition to the extraordinary things that he did, which are many and great, is witnessed to by Moses himself and the other prophets; He is also the only one who is called eternal Word of God by you, as well. He is the only one ever born of a virgin; the only one ever who ascended into heaven and remains there immortal; the only one ever who is hoped to come back thence to judge the living and the dead who will rise—to say about him only what you, too, the Turks confess. It is, therefore, for these that we believe in Christ and His Gospel. As far as Muhammad is concerned we do not find that he is either witnessed to by the prophets, or that he did anything unusual or worthwhile leading to faith. That is why we do not believe in him or his book.”

It was clear that Tasimanes was unable to put up with this. Yet he responded saying: “There was reference to Muhammad in the Gospel but you cut it out.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, setting out from the farthest East he progressed victoriously, as you can see, all the way to the West.” I, then, said to him: “Insofar as the gospel is concerned nothing was ever cut out from it by any Christian, or altered in any way. There are heavy and most shivering curses for such an act, and he who dares to either cut out or to alter anything, is cut off actually from Christ. How is it possible then, that a Christian did such a thing, or how could he be still a Christian, or in anyway acceptable among the Christians if he had erased off what has been divinely engraved and what Christ himself imprinted or foretold? Witnesses to this are also the many and various dialects in which the gospel of Christ was conveyed from the very beginning; it was not written originally in only one [dialect]. If anything was distorted, how did this pass unnoticed, and how was such an agreement kept in the minds of various nations until today? Also many people of a different faith have the Gospel of Christ, whom we call heretics, among whom there are some who agree with us on some issues, and yet they, too, do not have any such thing to show in the Gospel of Christ. Even among those who were adversaries from the beginning—and there are many of these—there is no such thing to be shown. The opposite, rather, can be found clearly in the Gospel. How is it then that the Gospel confirmed something to the opponents which itself does not contain and which was not told be-



fore to the divine prophets? If there were anything good about Muhammad written in the Gospel it would have also been written in the prophets. On the contrary, you may rather find not wiped out but written that "many false Christs and false prophets will arise and lead many astray."<sup>51</sup>

If Christ were like Moses and the prophets of all ages before and after him (they all returned through death to the earth resting there and awaiting the judge who is to come from heaven), the same would have happened with Him. In that case another prophet should have come after him again who would have ascended into heaven and brought his [mission] to an end; for the end of everything that is here is in heaven.<sup>52</sup> However, as you also confess, Christ did ascend into heaven and no-one of right mind does expect anyone after Him. Not only did Christ ascend into heaven, but it is the same who is expected to return as you, too, confess. Thus, he is the one who came, who comes, and who is expected to return and we, rightly so, neither accept nor are we waiting for anyone other than Him. He is expected to come again to judge all men. Why? Because, as He Himself said, the light that is He and His teaching came and became manifest to the world; but men, promulgating different teachings and indulging deeply in their own desires, loved the darkness rather than the light.<sup>53</sup> So that, therefore, this may not happen to us, the pinnacle of the disciples of Christ says, "there will be false teachers and false prophets who will bring in destructive heresies, and in their greed they will exploit you with false words; for many will follow their licentiousness."<sup>54</sup> Another one says, "even if an angel should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, let him be accursed."<sup>55</sup> And the evangelist says, "every spirit which does not confess that the Lord Jesus Christ has come in flesh, is not of God."<sup>56</sup> How would He who says that "he who confesses that Jesus—the one manifested in flesh—is not Lord, is not from God" have given a book that says that he who confirms this comes from God? This is not possible; not at all!

Muhammad marched from the East and he progressed victoriously to the West. He did so, however, by the means of war and the sword, with pillage, enslavement and executions, none of which has its origin in God, the righteous One, but he is advancing the will of him who from the beginning was the destroyer of man. How about Alexander? Did he not, starting from the West, conquer the East? There have also been other men at other times who, after repeated campaigns over-ruled the entire world. However, no nation en-



trusted their souls to any of them, as you did with Muhammad, who, although he resorted to violence and allowed licentious things, did not take into his fold even a whole portion of the world. On the other hand, the teaching of Christ although it directs one away from almost all the pleasures of the world, has embraced the universe to its ends. It endures even among its enemies without instigating violence, but rather every time winning the adversary force; for "this is the victory that has overcome the world."<sup>57</sup>

When I was saying this the Christians who happened to be there, seeing that the Turks were already getting irritated, signaled me to finish my speech. And I, changing to a milder tone and smiling gently at them, said again, "After all, if we were in one accord, we would be of one and the same faith, too." But let him who is intelligent appreciate the meaning of what we said. Then one of them said, "There will come a time when we will agree with each other." I consented and I amplified the wish that such a time may come more quickly. But why did I say this for those who abide by a different faith now, rather than for those who would be living then! I consented because I remembered the Apostle's saying that "at the name of Jesus Christ every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father";<sup>58</sup> and this will certainly come to pass in the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

At this the gathering dispersed for the day. As to what went on the next days the spirit is willing but the hand is not strong enough to write about. That much I wrote for those of you who desire to know. For children, and even more so those who are mindful of their spiritual adoption, want to know the experiences of their father. As when I was with you I used, privately and publicly, to teach you persistently with my words the way that leads to salvation, never lowering my standards even though some thought I was heavy to bear, the same thing I do now that I am absent and in the midst of tribulation. Even briefly, I am writing to you all, not withholding anything; for [this way] we become rich in God,<sup>59</sup> the living and the true One, who is witnessed to not only by God the Father and the God-sent prophets, but also by their works and deeds. Justifiably, therefore, He demands that our faith in Him be alive, truthful and witnessed to by God and by the teachers who come from God, as well as by their works and deeds. This, then, will be accomplished if we live according to the injunctions of the Gospel. For this way, the spirit of the grace of the Gospel "bears witness", according to the Apostle, "with our spirit that we are children of God;



and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ.”<sup>60</sup> This is the living faith; for “faith apart from works is dead,”<sup>61</sup> says another one of the preachers of faith. And something that is dead is not welcome by the living God; for God “is not God of the dead, but of the living.”<sup>62</sup> He, therefore, whose faith is dead for lack of good deeds, is himself also dead for not living and being in God—the only one who provides true and inviolate life; until such time as he experiences, like the saved prodigal son, the poverty that he suffered by taking distance from the deeds of life, and returns to God through the deeds of repentance, and until he hears from Him, the words like that saved prodigal son, “This my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found.”<sup>63</sup> This is the way to have a true faith. For faith that is not witnessed to by works of salvation is no more faith than unbelief and no more confession than apostasy. This is what he who talks about such things indicates: “They profess to know God, but they deny him by their deeds; they are detestable, disobedient, unfit for any good deed.”<sup>64</sup> Another of the fellow disciples says: “Show me your faith with your deeds”;<sup>65</sup> and “Who is faithful; by his good life let him show his deeds.”<sup>66</sup> What is the merit if one says that he has faith, but he shows no deeds? Can faith save him? Not at all. You may believe that Christ is one God along with the Father and the Spirit. Good enough. However, even the demons believe and are terrified when they say “We know who you are: the Son of God in the Highest.”<sup>67</sup> And yet the demons are adversaries, precisely because they oppose God with their works.

Be mindful not to be like these ill-minded men; I do not mean in regard to your reverence in God, but rather in your conduct as they suffered in the doctrine. For they confess that he who was born of the Virgin is the Word of God and spirit of His and Christ, that is God-man, but then they flee and break away from him madly as non-God. Take heed, therefore, not to be like them and find yourselves, on the one hand confessing that the virtues and the biblical injunctions are righteous, and on the other hand with your deeds breaking away from them as if they were not so; showing that what is indeed good is not good for you and what is indeed permissible is something to flee from.

Tell me, how is it possible that an unbeliever may trust you when you say that you believe in Him who was born of the Virgin, born from the Father beyond time and before all ages, and subsequently in time—in a supernatural way—by a mother, but you practice neither chastity nor prudence, and you rather insist passion-



ately and unrepentedly on the opposite [acts] and let yourself be surrendered to debauchery? How can the drunkard and the glutton show themselves as having become, through the Spirit, adopted sons of Him who fasted in the desert for forty days and who with His example gave the ordinance of temperance? How can he who loves injustice be one [an adopted son] of Him who commands us to judge with right judgment;<sup>68</sup> or the heartless, of Him who said "Be merciful, even as your Father in Heaven is merciful";<sup>69</sup> or he who has no sympathy and magnanimity towards those who fail or he shows no gentleness, tolerance and humility, to Him who showed us these virtues with deeds and who urged us towards them with words? For He says: "Learn from me; for I am gentle and lowly in heart, and you will find rest for your souls";<sup>70</sup> and "if you do not forgive the trespasses of your brethren, neither will your heavenly Father forgive your trespasses."<sup>71</sup> Even when he was hanging on the cross, offering Himself as an example to us, He kept saying to the Father not to hold this sin against them.

One might, of course, say that He was God and, as such, detached from evil. I have many things to say about this, but time does not allow me. I am not asking from you, however, for divine but human goodness. Make a start in this goodness and God will provide its perfection. Detach yourself from evil; stay in the place of virtue. Undertake the deeds of repentance and while waiting, you will receive from God not only the perfection of human goodness, but you will also acquire the supernatural divine virtues, by the coming of the Holy Spirit to dwell in you. This is how man is deified. For he who is clinging to God by means of the works of virtue becomes one spirit with God,<sup>72</sup> through the grace of the Holy Spirit. This may be with you all always now and ever and unto ages of ages. Amen.

Unlike another great Father of the East, John of Damascus, six hundred years earlier, Palamas demonstrates a popular rather than sophisticated knowledge of Islam. In this respect the above texts—although not yet fully analyzed—provide minimal original material to the Muslim-Christian dialogue. The significance of these texts lies in what we learn from them about the Byzantine Christians and the Muslims in Anatolia in the middle of the fourteenth century as a prelude to the dissolution of the Byzantine Empire. Even more so, however, we gain from them another insight of Gregory Palamas' own personality and of his progressive awareness of the Muslim



reality. What is significant is Palamas' direct—even though unwilling and circumstantial—encounter with Islam, as well as the fact that he intensely observed and diligently reported to his Christians what he observed and experienced; a valuable historical document. As a mystic he was better prepared than many of his contemporaries to transcend the visible physical circumstances and to address himself, as a spiritual master, to the more profound human spiritual condition.<sup>15</sup> He lived in captivity under the Turks, but he entered into a persistent, meaningful dialogue with them, earning their anger, but also their respect. He remained the hesychast teacher of deification.

Although these particular documents cannot offer but a limited view of the entire spectrum of the Byzantine anti-Islamic literature, they can nevertheless support tentatively the following general comment: Writers of spiritual and mystical disposition, although openly critical towards the Muslims, did not hesitate to enter into a dialogue with them. On the contrary, they allowed themselves convincingly to see Islam as part of God's wholesome and unknown scheme of human salvation. They saw Islam from the Christian point of view and as such coming short of God's ultimate offer—the Incarnation of his own Logos. Nonetheless they perceived Islam as the means through which the Muslims relate directly to God through word and spirit. Thus, John of Damascus—the theologian of the icon, the monk of the Judean desert, and possibly the initiator of Muslim-Christian dialogue—treats Islam as a *Christian* heresy. Gregory Palamas—the theologian of *theosis*, a leader of the hesychasts, and one of the last Byzantine interlocutors with Islam—treats Islam as *theoseveia*, even though he speaks of the Turks as “most barbaric among the barbarians.”

## NOTES

1. Of the extensive bibliography on Palamas one could still mention the work of Gregory Papamichael, *Ho Hagios Gregorios Palamas, Archiepiskopos Thessalonikes* (St. Petersburg and Alexandria, 1911), but especially the works of John Meyendorff, an authority on Palamas and the Palamite theology, particularly his *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris, 1959) (English edition *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, London, 1964) and *St. Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality* (N. York, 1974). The main source of Palamas' life is Philotheos, Patriarch of Constantinople (1354, 1364-76), *Encomion, or Laudation*, PG 151:551-656.

2. Cf. Philotheos, 626A.



3. The date of the fall of Kallipolis has been the subject of some controversy among certain specialists. A fourteenth century chronicle (published by Joseph Müller, "Byzantinische Analekten, Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften" in *Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 9 (1852) 336-419) specifies the date of the earthquake as having taken place on 2 March 1354 and it connects this event to the subsequent fall of the city to the Turks. This date, accepted originally by G. Georgiades Arnakis in *Oi Prōtoi 'Oθwμανοί*, No. 41 of the *Beihefte* of the *Byzantinischerugriechische Jahrbücher* (Athens, 1947), has been revised to 1355 by the same (in his "Gregory Palamas among the Turks and Documents of His Captivity as Historical Sources," *Speculum* 26 (1951) 111-12; and also in his "Gregory Palamas, the *Χιώτες*, and the fall of Gallipoli," *Byzantion* 22 (1952) 310ff), on the basis of some details of the present letter of Palamas which, I think, Arnakis has misunderstood. P. Charanis has convincingly shown ("On the date of the Occupation of Gallipoli by the Turks," *Byzantinoslavica* 16 (1955) 113-17) that the date 1354 is the right one, on the basis of the existing textual evidences. A closer reading of Palamas' texts points to 1354 as the year of the earthquake and of the fall of Kallipolis.

4. *Speculum* 26 (1951) 104-18.

5. PG, 151:626 B-C.

6. Cf. the Greek journal *Soter* (Athens), 15 (1892) 238.

7. Cf. the Greek journal, *Deltion tes Historikes kai Ethnologikes Hetairias tes Hellados* (Athens) 3 (1889) 227, on the information of the Notes from Fabricius' Library. Cf. PG, 150:777-78 (#VI).

8. PG, 150:808 (#LXVI).

9. "... A plusieurs reprises, il y a l'occasion d'exposer aux musulmans les mystères de la Trinité et de l'Incarnation, comme il la raconte lui-même dans une lettre adressée à son Église, *si toutefois la pièce est authentique*." "Palamas, Grégoire," in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, 11 (1932), p. 1740. The underlining is mine.

10. "You should know also that I came to live in Nicaea, during which time having some freedom I described briefly to your love the things regarding my captivity..." The wording of this statement suggests that Palamas wrote part of the letter in Nicaea and completed it elsewhere.

11. *Soter*, 15 (1892) 246. Cf. below.

12. Cf. e.g. "I will narrate, therefore, to your love what I have perceived to be of the providence of God when I was led to Asia through captivity..." Palamas sees as part of God's judgment not only the predicament of the Christian population in Anatolia, but also his own survival and experience through his captivity, which by then had perhaps ended.

13. Paul Wittek ("*Χιώτες*," *Byzantion* 21 (1951) 421-23) has challenged Arnakis' identification of the Chiones with the militant religious group of *Akhiyan*, which Arnakis promulgated in his article on Palamas in *Speculum*, 26 (1951) 114. Arnakis responded to the challenge ("Gregory Palamas, the *Χιώτες*, and the fall of Gallipoli," *Byzantion*, 22 (1952) 305-12) by analyzing etymologically the name and reaffirming his belief that the name signifies the *Akhis*. Wittek's suggestion is that the name Chiones is a distortion and evolution of the Persian and Turkish *khoja* which means master, teacher, clergyman; the Chiones therefore are, according to him, religious master or teachers.

14. *Soter*, 15 (1892) 240-46.

15. Cf. Meyendorff, *A Study of Palamas*, p. 115.

## NOTES TO THE TEXTS

1. I.e., Gregory Palamas.

2. Cf. [Ps. 76(77).20]; Rom. 11.33-34.